DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 009 UD 009 319

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | King, M. Sylvester |
| TITLE | Summer Teacher Training Institute in Poverty Areas in New York City. Evaluation of New York City Title I Educational Projects, 1966-67. |
| INSTITUTION | Bank Street Coll. of Education, New York, N.Y. Educational Resource Center.; Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Committee on Field Research and Evaluation. |
| Spons Agency | New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. |
| Pub Date | May 68 |
| Note | 96p. |
| EDRS Price | EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.90 |
| Descriptors | *Disadvantaged Schools, Elementary Schools, Junior High Schools, Program Evaluation, *Reading Instruction, Substitute Teachers, Summer Institutes, *Teacher Education, *Urban Schools |
| Identifiers | *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I Programs, New York City |

Abstract

This report evaluates a Summer Teacher Training Institute in poverty areas in New York City. The program encompassed two distinct types of training: (1) the Reading Institutes, designed to train reading teachers for the elementary and junior high schools in disadvantaged areas, and (2) the Teacher-Training Institute, set up to train both substitute and appointed teachers in the 19 districts involved in the programs. The evaluation is comprised of an intensive study, conducted while in active operation, of six institutes in four districts, constituting a representative sample of the total group of institutes. The report covers the opinions of the staff, participants and observers about the program, and presents the conclusions and recommendations arrived at. Tabulated results and sample questionnaire forms are appended. (KG)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROGRAM REFERENCE SER
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCA

09319 F

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

ED034009

# SUMMER TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTE IN POVERTY AREAS IN NEW YORK CITY

M. Sylvester King

UD 009319

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1966-67 school year.

Conducted under subcontract by the Bank Street College of Education, Educational Resource Center

Committee on Field Research and Evaluation
Joseph Krevisky, Assistant Director

May 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| Topic | Page |
|---|---|
| PREFACE | i |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| INSTITUTE OBJECTIVES AND FORMAT | 3 |
| EVALUATION DESIGN, METHODS AND LIMITATIONS | 4 |
| Limitations | 6 |
| WHAT THE PARTICIPANTS SAID | 8 |
| WHAT THE STAFF SAID | 21 |
| Proposed Changes | 29 |
| Staff Communication and Cooperation | 31 |
| HOW THE OBSERVERS VIEWED THE INSTITUTES | 34 |
| CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 42 |
| Planning | 43 |
| Selection of Staff and Involvement of Children | 46 |
| Summer Institutes | 49 |
| Selection of Participants | 49 |
| The Institute Program | 51 |
| Concluding Statement | 53 |
| APPENDIX A - Tables | A1 |
| APPENDIX B - Instruments | B1 |
| APPENDIX C - Staff List | C1 |

# PREFACE

Authorship, whether of a major work or of an occasional paper implies at least three things:

(1) A responsibility to the reader.

(2) The burden of proof.

(3) An obligation to one's colleagues.

In the ensuing report I have tried to live up to the first by keeping constantly in mind, as I wrote, the need for honesty, and by aiming for the elusive precision of expression which is often difficult to achieve.

For the second, where it is a matter of fact under discussion, I accept the responsibility to provide supportive evidence, if necessary.

As for the third, I acknowledge, with gratitude, the help that I have so generously received from my colleagues.

It is no idle caution that there is a risk in mentioning names of particular individuals, since an unintentional omission could have serious repercussions. I now incur that risk.

First, a word of recognition to the CUE staff (in particular, Mr. Joseph Krevisky, Mr. George Weinberg, and Mr. Lawrence Perkins) who have provided support and understanding at every phase of the project.

For her willingness to help, on very short notice, and for her perceptive comments about items in the questionnaire, my thanks go to Dr. Jacqueline Rosen of the Research Staff at Bank Street College.

The four observers, Mrs. Evelyn Farrar, Mr. Gaywood McGuire, Jr., Mrs. Adelaide Sanford,and Mrs. Marcella Williams submitted reports that were not only perceptive but clearly indicative of the skill and know-

how of the experts that they are. Without their efforts, the results reported herein would be impoverished indeed. I gladly pay them the public recognition they have earned.

The raw data forthcoming from six institutes present a challenge in organization and analysis. Mr. Michael Kinsler, who served as research assistant, proved himself more than equal to the task. With his help and questioning attitude, it was possible to generate the illustrative tables in Appendix A of the report.

My efforts to achieve clarity of expression and sharpness of focus were greatly enhanced by the thoughtful and often provocative comments and suggestions of both Dr. Garda Bowman, Program Coordinator for the Auxiliary School Personnel Study and Mrs. Lodema Burrows, Editorial Associate for the project. To them I also offer my thanks and admiration.

It is always rewarding to encounter the degree of cooperation which was so readily offered by the institute directors, by their staffs and by the participants themselves. Their willingness to tolerate our probing and to assist in whatever ways they could deserves high praise.

To all who typed, and collated, and worried with me about the many details which must be attended to in a project of this magnitude, I give my appreciation for their efforts. Among them I salute Mr. Nelson Castro, typist par excellence. In this connection I also single out for special mention Mrs. Dolores Stewart, my Administrative Assistant, whose willingness to assume responsibilities and to take initiative extended far beyond my fondest expectations.

I would be seriously remiss if I failed to pay tribute to my family, whose long-suffering patience with my erratic hours made it possible for me to devote to the preparation of this document the time and care it required.

Finally, in preparing this report, I was guided by a sense of obligation to the purpose for which the institutes were designed. I have tried to report accurately and impartially what the participants, the Staff and the observers have said.

On the basis of their comments, together with my own observations and my experience as an educator who has been working with disadvantaged children, I have drawn some conclusions and made some recommendations.

Given the choice of presenting either a report that is superficially laudatory or one that is honestly and critically seeking an assessment of the impact of the program on teacher effectiveness with disadvantaged children, I have chosen the latter. My professional integrity will allow nothing less.

October 1967

M. Sylvester King, Director
Educational Resources Center
BANK STREET AT HARLEM

# INTRODUCTION

It would be unnecessarily repetitive to begin this evaluation report with lengthy statements about the special needs of disadvantaged children and the urgency to find ways of meeting them within the educational context.

The literature grows daily as one "expert" after another advances his special panacea for dealing with the clearly recognized problem -- that of severe alienation of a significantly large segment of the pupil population from the schools.

What is important is that the New York City Board of Education has seriously begun its search for ways of reaching those whom it has not reached in the past. It remains to be seen whether the approaches it is using will achieve this very important objective. The difficulties sometimes seem insurmountable, and the efforts puny when measured against the magnitude of the problem.

In any event, during the summer just past, the Board sponsored a series of teacher-training institutes as another in its long list of attempts to meet its obligation of educating <u>all</u> of New York City's children.

The next several pages contain an <u>evaluation report</u> which is based on observer reactions and on the views and expressed attitudes of staff and participants. It is not a research study with all the benefits of a classic design. For a variety of reasons, some of which are spelled out below in the section dealing with the limitations of the current report, such a rigorous research design was not feasible.

Yet the value of this kind of subjective reporting must be recognized, especially when it is dealing with areas of human behavior. To express all aspects of this complex process only in quantitative terms is to lose sight of the fact that skilled, sensitive observers can catch nuances and identify features which might go completely unnoticed in another scheme of reporting which depended only on statistical investigation.

Indeed, where independent observers of the same activity identify the same strengths and/or weaknesses, or make similar recommendations, or agree in any other way, this degree of observer reliability significantly increases the validity of the observation. Thus a subjective qualitative judgment can now generate a much higher confidence in its accuracy because it has gained in objectivity.

This evaluation report is presented, therefore, with a sincere hope that it will highlight some important activities, raise some useful questions and, perhaps, even offer some possible answers.

## INSTITUTE OBJECTIVES AND FORMAT

### Objectives

The project proposals authorizing the establishment of the Summer Teacher Training Institutes provided for two distinct types of training centers to be set up in 19 school districts in the city. The first, the Reading Institutes, were to train teachers of the junior, intermediate and high schools to teach reading to children in disadvantaged areas.

The second type of training center was the Teacher-Training Institute, set up to train both substitute and appointed teachers in each of the 19 school districts. The participants were teachers who were either newly assigned or in service for a short period. These institutes were organized to offer basic teaching methods to teachers in elementary, intermediate and junior high schools.

Seen in the broader context, these stated objectives are vehicles to a larger goal -- enabling the participants to become more effective in teaching disadvantaged children.

### Format

In keeping with the spirit of decentralization, still another attempt by the Board of Education to make school more relevant and responsive to local needs, each district was at liberty to choose its own format for its institutes. Thus some were held for only one week, while others lasted two, three or four weeks. Still others held a one-week session during the summer, with plans for continuing throughout the fall term or even throughout the year.

## EVALUATION DESIGN, METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

A major question which had to be dealt with immediately as one began to think in terms of a design was "How do you evaluate 41 institutes in 19 school districts?" Clearly the answer lay in looking only at a representative sampling. Since 15 of the institutes in eight districts were planned for the regular school year, and the evaluation was to be done only in the summer, it meant choosing a sample from among 26 institutes in 12 districts.

The limitations imposed by the funds allotted to the evaluation project, as well as the availability[1] of experienced personnel to serve as observers, had some bearing on the decision to select a sample of six institutes in four districts (one each in Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn and Queens).

The selection of these six institutes for intensive study was made in an effort to diversify the sample as much as possible, both as to the type of institute and to the time format. Thus, two of them were reading institutes, and the other four, teacher-training.

With respect to the time format, three of the six in the sample were in operation for two weeks, one had a three-week span, and the other two each lasted for four weeks. None of the one-week institutes were included, since they were planned to continue throughout the year, and the evaluation was limited to the summer.

---

[1] By the time the arrangements were all made with the Center for Urban Education, most of the persons who would ordinarily have been available to serve had either taken other positions or gone off for the summer.

Sample Institutes Evaluated

| Institute | Type | Duration |
|---|---|---|
| A | Reading | 2 weeks |
| B | Teacher Training | 2 weeks |
| C | Teacher Training | 4 weeks |
| D | Reading | 4 weeks |
| E | Teacher Training | 2 weeks |
| F | Teacher Training | 3 weeks |

For each of the institutes, two independent observers were in attendance at the proceedings on the same two consecutive days. Each observer paid at least one other visit to the institute either before or after the two-day observation. The two-man independent observer teams were differently comprised for each two-day visit. Thus for institute "A," observers x and y made up the team; but for institute "B," the observers might be x and z or y and z. Each observer was armed with an observation guide (copy in Appendix B) which had been prepared in advance. In this way, the observers were all asking essentially the same questions and looking for the same kinds of interactions.

For each day of observation, the observers spent the full period, often arriving before the activities got under way, and remaining to chat with participants after the formalities had ended. During the breaks and other free periods, the observers informally interviewed participants and staff. Each observer submitted a written report after each visit.

On the last day of the institute, all participants and staff members were asked to fill out questionnaires (copies in Appendix B). The completed forms were collected immediately -- a fact which insured a

much higher number of responses than might otherwise have been expected had the respondents been asked to return the questionnaires by mail. Great emphasis was placed on anonymity in order to encourage the respondents to be as candid as possible.

## Limitations

The use of questionnaires as data-gathering vehicles imposes certain limitations on the accuracy of the results. But beyond these, there are at least four major ones which must be borne in mind as one assesses the significance of this report.

1. During the period when the institutes were being initially designed, apparently the planners gave little, if any consideration to the methods by which they would be evaluated. This view is supported by the fact that it was only after the proposed formats had been fully approved that the evaluating agency was engaged to perform its function. The result of this sequence is that the very evaluation techniques which might be most effective in assessing the degree to which the institutes were achieving their objectives would have to be imposed on a format which may or may not lend itself to these techniques.

It becomes extremely difficult, if not impossible, therefore, to generate a rigorous research design -- no opportunity having existed for the researcher or evaluator to build into the initial plans those components which would be essential to the research study.

2. The findings and recommendations which result from a very close look at six sample institutes are not necessarily the same as would be forthcoming if all of the institutes were studied. For example, it is

possible that the 15 which will be carried on during the year may achieve results which cannot be assessed by studying only those that are being conducted in the summer months alone. For one reason, the participants will be actually involved with children every day, and the institute activities will therefore have a more immediate meaning and application than was true in the summer.

3. The whole purpose of the institutes was to make teachers more effective with disadvantaged children. Yet the evaluations were made before the participants again got the opportunity to work with the children in a systematic fashion. The most that can possibly be determined under these conditions is a statement about the extent to which the teachers <u>believe</u> they will be more effective.

4. To speak of making teachers more effective is to assume some knowledge of their level of effectiveness before the fact. Such data are not available. Therefore no real comparison can be established. In short, a serious limitation exists because it is not possible to isolate the probable effect of the institute training.

It is true that this concern would have little relevance for those teachers who came to the institute with no previous classroom experience. But the fact is that the vast majority of the participants had been teaching before enrolling in the summer program.

## WHAT THE PARTICIPANTS SAID

The six sample institutes, enrolling 273 participants, differed widely, and the responses on the questionnaires reflect this variety. For example, their answers to the question: "What specific reasons did you have for attending this institute?" range from the very selfish (to earn the money - 13 per cent) to the more altruistic (to become better teachers - 16.5 per cent).

It should be understood clearly, before responses are examined, that because of the open-ended nature of the questions, many participants gave multiple answers to a single question. Thus the percentages quoted represent proportions of the number of responses to a given question, rather than of the number of participants responding.

Reporting the figures in this way makes it necessary to use additional caution in interpretation. Those who suggested money as a reason for their attendance may also have cited other reasons. It is not possible to tell from the figure, 13 per cent, how many of those responses were singular, or how many were part of a larger answer, or, in the latter event, how important was the "money" in relation to the other reasons offered.

It seems feasible to conclude that the person who indicates that his only or chief motivation is money is saying something quite different from the person who includes it among other reasons. Equally, the respondent who lists "money" as his first reason among others is also communicating a different answer from the one who lists it in a secondary position.

In keeping with these distinctions the following figures and relationships should be of interest. Of the 273 participants, 20 (7.25 per cent) of them listed money as the only or first reason for attending the institute. In the first category were 12 (4.35 per cent) respondents, and in the second, eight (2.9 per cent).

Some quotes from this group of 20 participants give a flavor of their attitude:

> "I couldn't get another job and felt this would be worthwhile."
>
> "One hundred fifty dollars and vague hopes that the institute would be helpful..."
>
> "I needed the $75.00 per week (tax free). As long as I needed money, I thought that I might as well learn something."
>
> "No specific reason."
>
> "I almost was taking a course in college and had nothing to do in July."

The other 253 participants, however, gave a variety of reasons which had nothing to do with money. Some sample comments follow:

> "To discover what the needs of disadvantaged children are."
>
> "To learn how to effectively manage and deal with children in the classroom."
>
> "To gain a better understanding of problems in the classroom and the school system."
>
> "To learn the skills necessary in incorporating reading into my subject area."
>
> "To get a working understanding of how a teacher performs."
>
> "I wanted to attend this institute to become familiar with some of my colleagues and supervisors, to familarize myself with the community and some of its resources,

> and to acquire a more positive attitude toward my responsibilities as a teacher."
>
> "I was interested in learning teaching techniques as well as how to cope with disruptive children."
>
> "I hoped to get a better approach and rapport with these children...I wanted to be more effective in my relation to children that I came in contact with."

With respect to the category, "become a better teacher," it is of interest to note that, among the ten categories which the participants identified, it is the only one that implies a change in the participant, e.g., in his interactions with youngsters, in his ability to reach and influence them.

If the literature is correct in its insistence that success with disadvantaged pupils requires much communication at the feeling level in addition to a highly developed teaching skill, then this is a very important category and a desirable reason for involvement in the institute program.

The fact that only 16.5 per cent of the responses fell into this category might suggest that the majority of the participants did not regard these factors in the affective domain as important as some of the ones they identified in the cognitive realm.

It is true that approximately one-half of the responses (See Table I, Appendix A)[2] expressed concern with improving teaching techniques and 14 per cent dealt with acquiring greater knowledge about disadvantaged children. But even though the latter category may imply an affective component, they are both more cognitive than affective.

---

[2]All tables for this report are in Appendix A.

Another interesting observation is the fact that the institute with the highest number of responses (27.5 per cent) in the category "become a better teacher" showed the second lowest number of responses (8.6 per cent)[3] that indicated money as a reason for attendance. On the other hand, more than one-fifth (20.8 per cent) of the responses from institute "D" mentioned money as a motivating factor, while only 10.4 per cent fell into the "become a better teacher" category.

The second question, "When you return to your classroom in September, what things will you do differently?" generated a set of responses which bear some similarity to those of the first question. As shown in Table II, 80 percent of the answers dealt with content and curriculum (cognitive), while only 20 per cent was related to interaction with children (affective). Compare these with the figures in question one in which 83.5 per cent of the responses offered cognitive reasons for the participants' involvement in the institutes, while only 16.5 per cent were concerned with those in the affective domain.

It would seem, given this analysis of these two sets of responses, that the benefits the participants received from the institutes were limited to those things which they can do without any serious personal involvement with the children.[4]

Another explanation might be that the participants interpreted the institutes' objective -- greater teaching effectiveness with disadvantaged

---

[3]The lowest was 8.5 per cent.

[4]See comment made by an institute director in section "How the Observers Viewed the Institutes," p. 36

children, to mean learning more techniques, finding the special curriculum that works, putting greater emphasis on reading, or any others of the standard remedies that are currently being proposed in educational circles.

The rest of the questionnaire asked essentially four major questions:

A. What things in the institute influenced your thinking?

B. What did you get out of it?

C. What changes would you make in future institutes?

D. Would you advise others to attend?

The participants' answers to each of these questions will be considered in turn.

Some interesting inconsistencies are revealed by a comparative study of the data compiled in response to the first question. The respondents were asked to rate certain specified aspects of the program. The overwhelming majority of the responses, 90.7 per cent, considered the guest speakers as being"extremely valuable' or"valuable." Yet when the instructions were to "identify those aspects of the program which influenced your thinking" only 31.4 per cent of the responses identified guest speakers.

Similar relationships are revealed in the two sets of responses for staff presentations (82.3 per cent vs. 32.8 per cent), demonstration lessons (87.4 per cent vs. 5.3 per cent) and small group discussions (81.2 per cent vs. 8.9 per cent).

It is quite significant that the discrepancy is so large for the last two -- demonstration lessons and small group discussions. When their influence is recognized by such a small minority of the participants' responses, this would seem to suggest strongly the need for

taking another critical look at their supposed effectiveness.

Such a need becomes even more urgent in view of the fact that both demonstration lessons and small group discussions are mainstays in the teacher education process. To underscore this observation even further, 13.6 per cent and 18.8 per cent respectively of the responses stated flatly that they were of no value.

Beyond the fact of what the data reveal, there still remain some questions: Why does the discrepancy exist? Are the participants really condemning demonstration lessons and small group discussions generally, or are they only pointing the finger at the quality of the ones that were held during the institutes?

With respect to the first question, there is little direct evidence. But an understanding of typical patterns of response to questionnaires leads to an educated guess. Clearly the two questions which generated the dissimilar responses were differently perceived by the respondents. It may be that,in the first set of responses,they were being polite rather than being accurate.

On the second question, some respondents have spoken very eloquently and critically. About demonstration lessons:

> "These are so necessary and useful but in this course were not given in great enough quantity."
>
> "Only saw one, and that was just students quietly working. Saw no effective lessons. Should have seen many."
>
> "Again these would have been of more value if done by participants."
>
> "First lesson was a horror given by a teacher who needs a course in human relations."

"Demonstrations should have been done by experts."

Some of the participants' views on small group discussions are also illuminating:

> "Topics were not vital enough. They dealt too much with reading techniques."
>
> "Proved to be an outlet for angry teachers -- too many arguments."
>
> "Too lax and generally not to the point."
>
> "No structure."
>
> "Carried on as if we were a group of small children, rather than as dignified, adult professionals."

Angry and condemnatory as the comments may seem, it is quite apparent that the participants still have faith in the efficacy of the two techniques -- provided they are well executed. Their dissatisfaction with what they regard as the poor quality of the demonstration lessons as well as the lack of focus of the small group discussions prompted their commentary.

The participants' answers to the next major question: "What did you get out of it?" give much cause for concern. Here again the responces run the gamut from high praise to extremely uncomplimentary remarks.

For this reason, Tables VI-A and VI-B which summarize the main categories into which many of the responses fell do not give a complete picture. They do reveal some interesting facts and relationships, however. For example, there is a higher number of irrelevant responses as well as a higher frequency of no responses (to all parts of the question[5])

---

[5]See participants' questionnaire, Appendix B, Questions 5A, 5B, 5C.

than for any other question in the entire questionnaire.

The significance of this fact cannot be identified with certainty, but it might suggest an unwillingness on the part of many participants to deal with matters involving their feelings toward disadvantaged children. This educated guess may be further supported by a second notable fact.

The responses (Table VI-A, first category) suggest that most of the participants in no way altered their feelings about these children. This is not automatically an unfavorable criticism. Perhaps many of the respondents came to the institutes with healthy, positive feelings which may have been reinforced. Such persons would report "no change." Yet it would be erroneous, on this basis alone, to condemn the institutes for not providing significant input.

On the other hand, the high percentage of responses indicating no change (83.2 per cent in one institute) might also be challenging the effectiveness of the institute programs. On this point, some of the actual quotations from the participants may shed some light:

> "We know why they can't read.... Pupils refuse to work or do their assignments."
>
> "Very little. In fact probably less; because I have been told that my experience gave a false picture."
>
> "I wish their cultures allowed for such help.... I think many of them are literally doomed."
>
> "Probably somewhat less sympathetic and less concerned after having been subjected to severe abuse from minority group leaders..."
>
> "The children and parents blame the teachers.... They feel we are biased and stamp them as non-learners because of their race."

> "I have received no knowledge from this institute that will improve my teaching skills."

These comments, made by participants after they have completed the institute program, do not speak well for its effect on them. Herein lies the cause for concern. While it is true that many other participants had many complimentary things to say, it remains a fact that those quoted above, and many others who share their views, do teach disadvantaged children, and were enrolled in institutes especially designed for improving their teaching effectiveness with these children.

But even as the impact of the program has been brought into serious question by the expressed attitudes of some participants, many of their colleagues have clearly indicated the benefits they received:

> "That they (disadvantaged children) should get more understanding from teachers."
>
> "I think there is more hope for them than I did previously."
>
> "I feel that all children, if properly taught can learn...."
>
> "I am now more aware...this awareness will influence my teaching."
>
> "I came to see them as people."
>
> "I feel less hostile and more compassionate."
>
> "I will feel more sure of myself...."
>
> "I realize now that they may be hardened on the outside but very sensitive on the inside. It is my job to break through."

The third of the four major questions referred to above was: "What changes would you make in future institutes?" In two of the areas -- stated objectives and selection of staff -- a clear majority (60 per cent

and 57 per cent respectively) of the responses indicate "no change." In the third area -- program content -- although the "no change" category does not contain a majority of the responses, it is the ranking one among all the other categories.

Tables V-A, V-B and V-C show pretty straightforwardly the participants' recommendations. It is of interest to note that many of the changes suggested in program content are reasonably pedestrian and uninspired: "more concrete," "traditional curriculum," "teaching techniques," "according to grade level." One category did suggest that the content should grow out of actual interaction between teachers and children. It contained 14.7 per cent of the responses.

The second largest category in the list of recommended changes in stated objectives (13.3 per cent) calls for greater clarity and specificity of objectives. This implies that the institute goals were not sharply defined. In like manner, the next two recommendations -- more on teaching techniques for disadvantaged children and more information about the nature of disadvantaged children -- are also significant criticisms, particularly because the institutes announced focus was on improving teaching effectiveness with disadvantaged children.

With respect to selection of Staff, despite the implied satisfaction of the majority of the participants with the status quo (57 per cent of responses indicated no change), it is important to recognize that 17 per cent asked for selection of more qualified staff whose experiences were relevant to the task. In addition, a few responses from three institutes proposed the selection of minority group representatives. Finally, 17.8

per cent of the responses from one institute called for a more qualified coordinator. The reader will later see a high correlation between the participants' comments and those of the observers.[6]

The responses to another question: "How well did the staff and participants communicate with each other?" were also favorable in the majority (65.2 per cent). But as Table VII indicates, a higher minority (21.6 per cent) than in the previous question expressed unfavorable views.[7] It is significant that in 13.2 per cent of the cases there was no response to this question.

The intensity of the negative comments is apparent in the ones cited below:

> "Very poorly. Communication would have been greatly improved if the trainees hadn't been 'lectured at' hour after boring hour."
>
> "Staff took the attitude of aloofness."
>
> "They seemed almost united against the trainees."
>
> "Had a habit of treating the trainees as (sic) children."[8]
>
> "The program was run by a person who insisted on presenting his views and forcing them on every one... Only opened up topics for discussion which he allowed."

Opposing the 34.8 per cent who either did not respond or made unfavorable comments were many who believed differently. The following quotes illustrate how they perceived staff-participant relationships:

> "The staff and participants communicated very well with each other. There was a warm and friendly

---

[6] See section on "How the Observers Viewed the Institutes."

[7] In institute "F," 40.5 per cent of the responses were unfavorable.

[8] This comment appeared repeatedly.

atmosphere. All the questions of the participants were explicitly answered."

"Our planning sessions were democratic, and the needs of trainees were always first consideration."

"Very good. We are all professionals and the entire program had plenty communication."

"There was excellent rapport. Participants did not hesitate to ask questions and state views honestly."

"Very warm, friendly atmosphere. Informal and a very comfortable type situation."

"I think that there was good communication between the staff and participants. Instructors were interested and ready to listen, anxious to be helpful and answer questions about any school problems."

"Excellent. Many controversial topics were discussed and interesting opinions formed."

In the last question, the participants were offered still another opportunity to express their feelings about the institutes, generally. Would they advise their teacher colleagues to attend future institutes for teachers of the disadvantaged? A slight majority (52.9 per cent) of the responses indicated yes, even without money. This figure becomes 74.6 per cent when it is combined with those that also said yes, but with money.

It is not possible to know with certainty whether the latter group is making the recommendation because of the money or for other benefits to be gained from the institute. Some of their comments, which follow, do suggest, however, that money is a very important consideration in their recommendations:

"No one would or should give up leisure or employment without compensation."

> "Be realistic, and realize that money is important. There are no altruists."
>
> "I feel that teachers like everyone else must earn a living...."
>
> "I would not have anyone sit for four long, tedious weeks without pay."
>
> "If no money, then credit."

The assumption is that participants would advise others to attend only when they felt it was worth while to do so. On that basis, it is logical to conclude that at least the participants who made the responses in the "yes, without money" category found some definite value in the institute programs. In short, a majority of the participants have spoken in favor of the summer program.

But even though the favorable responses represent most of the group, it is important to note the fact that 25 per cent of the participants said "no." This figure is even more significant when it is recognized that every institute but one had a large percentage in this category.

A look at Table VIII reveals the details of the supportive evidence. In two institutes, "B" and "D," the figure is 20 per cent each. For "E," 19.4 per cent. For "F" and "A" respectively, it is 38.9 per cent and 45 per cent.

## WHAT THE STAFF SAID

In the field of education, as in any other area of human endeavor, it is true that the more sharply defined are the objectives, the more likely are the chances that they will be achieved. Programs which lack clear-cut goals must necessarily be diffuse; and much creative effort often becomes dissipated, instead of leading systematically to a desired outcome.

A useful criterion, therefore, for assessing the purposefulness and quality of the institutes was the extent to which the staff members were agreed on major objectives. It seems reasonable to assume that the closer the agreement, especially among the leaders of the same institute, the more highly coordinated would be their efforts in working toward the achievement of those goals.

Predictably, because of the decision by the Board of Education to allow each local district to design its own institutes in the light of its own needs, there would be variability in procedures and even in some details of the objectives. But given the specific target group at whom the institutes were aimed -- teachers of the disadvantaged, the widely recognized failures of the schools' programs among disadvantaged children, and the announced intention to use the institutes as one means of reducing these failures, one should understandably anticipate a good measure of agreement among the institute directors and staff on the major purposes of their programs.

Thus the first question[9] asked of the staff was: "Of the several objectives of the institute, which did you personally feel was the most

---

[9]See Staff Questionnaire, Appendix B.

important? Second most important? etc."

The chart on page 23 summarizes the responses for all of the institutes. It includes every category that was identified by at least two participants. Clearly a wide variability exists, a fact which poses some problems in interpretation. One way of assessing the data might be to consider category G as the most important, since it is the ranking one in that column, and category J as the second most, and again as the third most important, for similar reasons. In this veiw, the staff would be identifying as their major objectives G and J.

Another interpretation might be based on the number of times a particular category was mentioned. This approach would lead to their identifying, as the three major objectives of the institutes, J, H and G, in ranking order.

It is immediately apparent that the two methods have produced slightly different results. But although the rank order is reversed, it is significant that the same two objectives have emerged in each instance.

When the data are examined within institutes, except for reasonable correlation among the leaders of two of the programs, the variability is even wider. For example, the ten-member staff of one institute identified five different objectives as being "most important," while the three-man staff of another institute listed three different ones.

All told, the staff listed ten different "most important" objectives. Some of them, in addition to those listed in Chart I (p. 23) are: "Provide opportunity to share problems with others," "develop in teachers a belief in the abilities of disadvantaged children to learn," and "change teacher attitudes toward teaching disadvantaged children."

CHART I

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES IDENTIFIED BY STAFF AS BEING MOST IMPORTANT, SECOND MOST IMPORTANT, THIRD MOST IMPORTANT

| | Most Important | | Second Most Important | | Third Most Important | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. Times Mentioned | Rank | No. Times Mentioned | Rank | No. Times Mentioned | Rank | No. Times Mentioned | Rank |
| G - Develop in teachers an understanding of disadvantaged children. | 9 | 1 | | | 3 | 2 | 12 | 3 |
| H - Teach basic reading skills. | 7 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 18 | 2 |
| I - Make teachers more aware of the community. | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | | | 7 | 4 |
| J - Provide practical experience for teachers in planning and in classroom technique. | 3 | 4 | 11 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 19 | 1 |
| K - Give teachers a feeling of confidence. | 3 | 4 | | | | | 3 | 6 |
| L - Develop in teachers a desire to accept and work with disadvantaged children. | 2 | 6 | | | | | 2 | 7 |
| M - Prepare teachers to begin teaching in a disadv. area. | | | 5 | 3 | | | 5 | 5 |
| N - Help teachers to realize the importance of their role in the children's success or failure. | | | 2 | 5 | | | 2 | 7 |
| O - Expose teachers to various educational resources and materials | | | | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 |

However valuable or relevant might be the several objectives suggested by the staff, the fact is that no summer program could realistically expect to accomplish them all. Besides, their very numbers underscore the lack of firm agreement among the staff members of the various institutes as to the central purpose of the institute programs.

On another issue, however, that of the techniques used to achieve whatever the perceived goals for any of the institutes, there was full agreement. They all used demonstration lessons, small group discussions, guest speakers, staff presentations of one kind or another and field trips. When asked which of these, in their opinion, was most valuable to the participants, the instructor group ranked them in the order of the above listing.

Following are some of the staff comments about demonstration lessons and small group discussions:

> "The demonstration lessons with youngsters from the community were excellent illustrations of what we can and must expect from children no matter what their economic or ethnic background."
>
> "...provided graphic support."
>
> "Because one picture is worth a thousand words."
>
> "Concretely brought procedures before group."
>
> "Teachers actually saw good lesson planning -- asked questions."
>
> "Small group meetings. These answered the immediate needs of the participants."
>
> "These offered the most practical help for trainees."
>
> "Because more people get individual attention."
>
> "A give and take atmosphere in small groups encourages 'digestion' of ideas."

> "The intimacy of these small groups provided frank and candid discussions of unique problems troubling a teacher."

In a word, the staff was highly laudatory of the two techniques -- demonstration lessons and small group discussions, which are the sine qua non of teacher training procedures.[10]

The following chart summarizes their responses and also reveals that at the top of the list of those aspects considered least valuable are guest speakers and staff (their own) presentations.

CHART II

COMPARATIVE LISTING OF PROGRAM ASPECTS WHICH STAFF CONSIDERED MOST VALUABLE AND LEAST VALUABLE TO THE PARTICIPANTS

| | Most Valuable | | Least Valuable | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Rank | No. Times Mentioned | Rank | No. Times Mentioned |
| Demonstration Lessons | 1 | 20 | 5 | 2 |
| Small Group Discussions | 2 | 19 | 4 | 3 |
| Guest Speakers | 3 | 14 | 1 | 9 |
| Staff Presentations | 4 | 10 | 1 | 9 |
| Field Trips | 4 | 10 | 6 | 1 |
| Reading Assignments | 6 | 2 | 3 | 7 |

The fact that each of these two program aspects was mentioned so many times prompted a closer look at the data in order to discover the possible explanations. The immediate observation is that the bulk of the responses for these two items in the "least valuable" category comes from institute "E." But why did the staff of this institute react so negatively to these two techniques? It is important to note that one of

[10] See discussion about these in "What the Participants Said" (p. 16).

the items was their own performance. Why were they so critical of themselves? Or were they questioning something else? Their own words may shed some light:

> "Some large group presentations were overwhelming. Too much like what was in the methods books. Participants really didn't have time to absorb that kind of thing."
>
> "Certain large group lectures which were too theoretical and philosophical in nature. Some...were excellent, however."
>
> "Curriculum area had to be dealt with too briefly to be practical."
>
> "Many of the talks to the whole group by outside speakers and staff members (my underlining) were poorly organized, spurious in content and enervating to the audience."

The institute "E" staff were equally vocal on the issue of guest speakers:

> "The guest consultants were not always of the highest calibre."
>
> In some instances the relationship between the topic and actual school was very remote. In addition, these presentations were far too consuming of time."
>
> "...community resource people...presented too general a lecture that added nothing to help the trainees."
>
> "Getting information first hand (rather than by listening to speakers)...experiencing, is the most meaningful way of learning."
>
> "None of those aspects were particularly valuable, because poor planning and constant change in schedules dissipated their effectiveness.

On the issue of the staff presentations, there are at least two kinds of criticisms. The one suggests that the technique itself, under the given circumstances, was not best suited to the task: "Curriculum

area had to be dealt with too briefly...." The other is highly critical of the quality and content of particular presentations: "Overwhelming," "too theoretical and philosophical," "poorly organized," "spurious," "enervating."

The emphasis on the "practical" is in keeping with one of the major objectives already identified by the staff (item J on Chart I, p. 23). But it is interesting to note the revelation by the data that some of the staff members who faulted their colleagues for not being practical were themselves, in turn, criticized by these very people for being too theoretical.

This mutual placing of blame either raises the spectre of possible friction among the members of this staff, or pointedly suggests the need for some clarification and/or consensus about what is meant by "practical."

The first suggestion is borne out by the responses which the staff members of this institute gave to a later question. It asked how they would rate the level of communication and cooperation among the staff members at their center. Their answers reveal a situation of tension, mistrust and competition. For example, one staff member reported: "Too much communication or rather talk." Others commented:

> "I feel that there was some rivalry."
>
> "One member of the staff could not see the institute arranged on grade level. By much loud talking was able to prevent this kind of arrangement... Another instructor was more interested in dealing with the social aspect than the instructional."
>
> "Shocking! The staff members for the most part were hostile, defensive and competitive in a petty sense toward each other. Some behaved like 'prima donnas.' Some exhibited gross infractions of good principles of human relations, both privately and before the group of trainees."

The reactions to the guest speakers also reflect at least a two-fold kind of complaint. The one questions the value of speakers in this setting: "Getting information first-hand, by experiencing, is the most meaningful way of learning." The other attacks directly the qualifications of the speakers and the quality and/or appropriateness of their presentations.

> "Guest consultants not always of highest calibre."
>
> "Relationship between topic and actual school very remote."
>
> "Too general a lecture that added nothing to help the trainees."

Finally, when the influences of the responses from institute "E" are removed from all categories in the "least valuable" column, as shown in Chart III below, the picture emerges in a much more predictable fashion.

CHART III

RANK LISTING OF PROGRAM ASPECTS WHICH STAFF OF FIVE INSTITUTES* CONSIDERED LEAST VALUABLE TO THE PARTICIPANTS

| | LEAST VALUABLE | |
|---|---|---|
| | Rank | Times Mentioned |
| Reading Assignments | 1 | 7 |
| Small Group Discussions | 2 | 3 |
| Staff Presentations | 2 | 3 |
| Guest Speakers | 4 | 2 |
| Demonstration Lessons | 4 | 2 |
| Field Trips | 6 | 0 |

*Institute "E" responses excluded.

Proposed Changes

The variability which marked the staff responses to the first three questions on the questionnaire is equally characteristic of their recommendations for changes in future institutes. With respect to selection of participants, the staff called for many modifications. Among them are: include only inexperienced teachers; make participation mandatory for all teachers; organize institutes on strict grade level/subject basis; give in-service credit for attendance; screen prospective enrollees more closely; increase the number of participants, and many others. With all of these recommendations, more than 20 per cent of the staff for the six institutes said "no change."

For program content, the most frequently mentioned change was for the involvement of participants with children. Some instructors called for more extensive tours -- both of neighborhood schools and of the community. Still others suggested including more information about disadvantaged children, their parents and background. One group recommended that neighborhood children be invited as participants, and that they be paid a stipend for their involvement. Here again a significant percentage of the entire staff (20 per cent) wanted "no change."

Although the staff considered the guest speakers as the third most valuable aspect of the institute program, there were many recommendations for changes in the selection and use of the speakers. Some suggestions were: use more of them; screen them more carefully; get more effective, more knowledgeable ones; make them available to small groups; include more Board of Education personnel;[11] recruit speakers earlier; select

---

[11]This recommendation was frequently made.

Puerto Rican educators and allocate less time to guest speakers.

As in the preceding two sets of recommendations, 20 per cent of the entire staff again claimed that they would not propose changes in the way guest speakers were used in the current institutes.

The next set of responses has a special significance because the instructor group was asked to evaluate themselves. The question was: "What changes would you make concerning the staff?" The first interesting fact to emerge is a predictable one -- 40 per cent of the group saw no need for changes. Only three persons suggested that the instructors selected should have worked with disadvantaged children; and two proposed that they ought to be more qualified. This means that 14 per cent (five out of 36) of the group asked for these two changes. Seventeen per cent of the participants' responses called for similar changes in the staff.

Other recommendations were to use aides to assist with the handling of supplies and materials, and to include an artist who would prepare slides and other transparencies for the overhead projector. Some felt that greater care should be taken in staff selection in order to insure a harmonious working relationship among the instructors for a given institute. Another suggested that the coordinator should have a voice in the selection of staff. The proposal from one institute was that the instructor group should be "composed of A.P.'s (assistant principals) appropriate to the level of the group led."

It is interesting to observe that not a single staff person suggested either of two recommendations which the participants made -- "involve some community people as instructors" and "select teachers who are more attuned to the community."

Staff Communication and Cooperation

The staff was next asked to rate the level of communication and cooperation both among themselves within institutes, and between them and the participants. On the first issue -- in-group rapport, 77.7 per cent (28 out of 36) gave positive responses. Six of the eight negative responses came from institute "E" whose rather strained staff relations have already been discussed (pp. 26-27).

Regarding the quality of cooperation and communication between staff and participants, an overwhelming 91.6 per cent (33 out of 36) of the instructors spoke favorably. This figure is significantly higher than the 65.2 per cent of the participants who also reacted positively to the staff-participant relationship.

The comparative percentages do suggest some differences in perception between the staff and the enrollees. It is not possible to tell with certainty which of the two groups more accurately reported the reality. But the comments made by many staff people in this regard do lack some of the precision and relevant details of those made by the participants.

Typical of what the staff said are the following: "Wonderful," "excellent," "good" (often with no further explanatory remarks).

> "A fine rapport existed between staff and trainees. For example, many times the staff would devote their own time in conducting conferences with the individual trainees."
>
> "Excellent. Participants gave token gifts to staff."
>
> "On the whole very good. Most of the participants were interested and serious.... They helped in running the audio-visual machine.... One or two seemed to be attending only to collect the stipend."

> "Good. Some persons were quite negative and did a minimum of work. Came in late."

The preceding comments are not unlike the ones made by the staff in their assessment of the impact of the program on the participants.

> "Feedback was evidenced in the hallways, restaurants, before and after sessions, indicating the worth of this institute."
>
> "The participants felt that this program will aid them immensely in teaching the under-privileged children in our district."
>
> "Our program had much variety in it and all the participants derived value from all or some of its aspects."
>
> "They were glad to learn the techniques of teaching the reading skills...."
>
> "Good! The attedance was good. The program was varied and stimulating. It was well planned. A schedule for each day was worked out, so that everyone knew what to prepare for."

On the basis of these quotes, it would seem that the staff drew their inferences from their observations of the activities and interactions. But, apparently, they were far more willing than the participants to interpret generously.

It is also interesting to observe that very few of their comments suggested any effort, on their part, to look critically at their own actions and the possible negative effects of these on the enrollees. There seemed to be a taking for granted that whatever they did was somehow or other "right" for the participants.

In assessing the impact of their institute involvement on their own professional growth, the entire staff, with two exceptions,[12] acknowledged

---

[12] One gave a negative response, the other did not answer.

some positive effect. Many of their answers were thoughtful, and reflected an introspection which was not as apparent in their earlier comments.

One person observed: "I feel that I learned as much as or perhaps more than the participants. While before I was committed intellectually, I now feel committed emotionally and sympathetically." Others reported:

> "I have had to review, refresh and redirect some of my teaching skills."
>
> "It has reawakened many areas of teaching that were taken for granted."
>
> "The Institute "challenged me to search for ways to help myself and other teachers to develop the potential of our disadvantaged children."
>
> "Became more aware of the problems these new teachers experience."
>
> "It provided an opportunity to understand and better appreciate the feelings of teachers."

If, as these comments suggest, the institutes have sparked in the instructor group a desire to reassess themselves, to rethink their supervisory roles, to renew their search for increasingly effective techniques, then there has been an added pay-off beyond the announced purpose of helping teachers to cope successfully with the academic needs of disadvantaged children.

The words are only a beginning. The really crucial test is the extent to which they are translated into action. It remains to be seen whether the performance will justify the words.

## HOW THE OBSERVERS VIEWED THE INSTITUTES

Up to this point in the report, the emphasis has been on what the participants and staff, those most directly involved, have said about themselves and about each other. This section is devoted to what others, not directly concerned, have said about them and their activities.

All of the observers agree that there were occasional examples of excellent and inspiring teaching. In their own words:

> "The quality of this instructor's program was excellent."
>
> "The key instructors [in one particular institute] are master teachers."
>
> "She knew her subject . . . and involved the participants."

In a few instances, the atmosphere was described as "stimulating" and "vital." One observer reported: "The room was alive and the participants were captivated." Another, reacting to the same situation, remarked: "The institute had vitality and excitement."

When all of the institutes are considered, the staff-to-participant ratio was 1:7.7. Two of the institutes had a 1:10.5 ratio (the highest), and one claimed a 1:3.6 (the lowest). Some of the guest speakers were stimulating, often presenting many significant challenges and demonstrating an (enviable) grasp of the problems with which the institutes were attempting to grapple. In two instances the observers commented: "She [the guest speaker] was provocative and dynamic," and "the excellent speaker . . . raised many issues for discussion."

The specialists (reading, audio-visual, mathematics) were effective, in the main, especially as they were able to work in small group settings.

Many of the participants were taught how to handle and operate some audio-visual equipment, e.g. the tape recorder, the 16mm sound projector, the overhead projector and various kinds of film strip machines.

It is to the credit of one institute director in particular that he allowed for some participant decisions about the program content. Said the observer: "The program was flexible enough to allow for the inclusion of topics or guests suggested by the trainees."

Every institute staff showed at least a verbal awareness of the importance of community involvement with the schools. Predictably, some went further than others in translating the idea into action. For example, one institute was satisfied with having the head of a community agency tell the group about his work. Another institute, on the other hand, took the participants into the community where they came into direct contact with the people and their activities.

Where children were not available, several of the participants "taught" their colleagues in a modified kind of practicum. This was clear recognition, on the part of those involved, of the importance of being able to test, in the crucible of classroom reality, the otherwise hollow theories about effective teaching of disadvantaged children.

The observers, too, showed keen recognition of some equally crucial factors bearing on the institute objectives and the probability of their being achieved. To the man, they all raised questions about the criteria for selection of staff. Their observations of the summer's activities have heavily underscored the need for this reconsideration. A few examples will suffice.

Many instructors were not professionally prepared for the tasks they were performing. For example, some who were teaching reading had had no previous background in doing so. Others had experienced little or no success in training teachers in disadvantaged areas, but they were "the authorities" in some institutes. "As far as I could gather," said one observer, "not one instructor had experience relevant to the position he held in the institute."[13] Still others demonstrated negative attitudes toward minority people or revealed serious misconceptions about the learning potential of disadvantaged children.

One observer was moved to comment, after witnessing two instructors' angrily disrupt two sessions being addressed by guest speakers:

> "It was obvious, in both instances, that these two instructors were over-confident, intolerant and inflexible, in addition to being hostile to change and to constructive criticism. This was a very poor example for the trainees."

In another case, the leader of the institute actually advocated that teachers should not become involved with the children.[14] More than one observer reported the widespread use of cliches and generalities among instructors who, by the position they were occupying, should have approached the issues with greater sensitivity and deeper knowledge.

---

[13]The quotation referred only to one particular institute.

[14]This calls to mind an earlier analysis of the participants' expectations (p. 11).

With respect to the instructional program, the observers took cognizance of those instances where they regarded it as relevant, stimulating, vital. One characteristic comment, for example, was: "The students were . . . optimistic and enthusiastic about the program." By the same token, however, it would be misleading not to include their criticisms when they found the program lacking in substance -- and there was a disturbing frequency of these criticisms. Their reports contain such commonly occurring descriptive terms as mediocre, not specific for the stated objectives, uninspiring, insufficient depth, misdirected.

One observer reported how two classes actually "sat through a lengthy penmanship lesson in which manuscript writing was taught to a class of . . . teachers. The session was not spent discussing methods of motivating the lesson, but rather in having each participant write each letter of the alphabet using the line and the circle."

In the light of the foregoing observations, it is not surprising, then, that much of the teaching was characterized as "ineffective," "too much lecture," "traditional," "instructor-dominated," "not well planned." In each instance the observers cited examples to support their conclusions.

**The following quotes illustrate the kind of evidence presented:**

> "/The/ Institute Director conducted a large group session from 9:10 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. First he wrote the homework assignment on the board for the following day. He began the . . . session by reading some passages on ITA (Initial Teaching Alphabet) and asking the participants to state whether the statements were valid or not. Many participants found it difficult to follow his reading and /he/ made no attempt to give out copies of what he was

> reading. Actually /he/ wanted to lead a discussion on the importance of criteria but he never conveyed this to the participants. His reading to the group was a very poor motivation; and whenever a participant disagreed with him he stated: 'We don't have time to discuss this any longer. Let's move on to something else.' /He/ constantly looked at his watch."

From another institute ". . . The one and one-half hour large group presentation was long and loose. The instructor had to continue to 'look for' the next item he wanted."

From still another: "/The instructor/ failed to give the participants an outline or guide as to what they were to observe in the classroom to which they were assigned. Merely stating 'jot something down' was insufficient."

From a third institute:

> "I observed five participants reporting on five different chapters of the assigned text, "Reading in the Secondary Schools" by M. J. Weiss . . . The Assistant Coordinator summarized each presentation made by the participants by monotonously going through all the steps of a reading-lesson plan. Not one person mentioned any new, special or different techniques that might be used to capture the attention of disadvantaged youth or encourage them."

All of the observers also agreed on two other issues: 1) that time was not efficiently used in many instances, and 2) that many participants communicated, by their actions and responses, an unfortunate attitude toward the institutes.

On the first, as one observer put it: "Every activity began late." Other observers mentioned how ten-minute breaks were stretched to 25 minutes; how the period between 8:30 and 9:00 was often wasted; how some small group discussions rambled on with no particular focus or specified

objective; how an entire day was spent presenting audio-visual material that should have required only three hours if it were better organized. Yet the same observer said of another institute: "It began promptly and adhered to time schedules."

The second issue is clearly illustrated by an observer's comment: "Many participants slept through the presentation, no one took notes, while others read the newspapers or did their nails." In another instance: "Some participants were reading newspapers, working crossword puzzles or simply daydreaming." In still another: "Several chewed gum, wrote letters or read novels not related to the course."

A more disturbing observation was that some participants expressed open hostility to minority groups. For example, one participant remarked after a minority group speaker had made a presentation: "He made us very uneasy. We became riled and almost resorted to name calling." Others communicated their belief that disadvantaged children were incapable of achieving well academically. Still others demonstrated a stereotyped, erroneous view of parents of the ghetto community. To cite one observer: "In a role-playing episode, the participant portraying the parent depicted her as being illiterate, with no husband but many boyfriends, careless with her responsibilities, a liar, holding ambitions for her child not in keeping with her own laissez-faire manner. When she indicated that her son 'wants to be a doctor,' the class laughed."

Of equal interest is the portrayal of the teacher in the role-playing situation outlined above. "/She/ was depicted as being highly organized. /She/ had data and facts about the child. 'He is good with

his hands -- I do mean good.' (class laughed). 'He is cute.'" The observer asks: "What is this teacher's perception of this student?" "What are her expectations for his classroom performance?"

But while the observers have been disarmingly frank in their assessment of the situation, they have not failed to take note of many desirable participant characteristics. One reported that "the evidence, through responses, indicated that a few of the participants would have been better instructors than the instructors."

Another observer: "The participants were young and eager . . . seemed of a particularly fine and sensitive quality."

In a similar view, the observers recognized value in many of the community experiences provided for the participants. The neighborhood tours, the visits to libraries, the materials on community services, the involvement of community people. But they questioned whether much of this was a formality without substance. For example, it is useful to distribute a listing of the names and locations of hospitals in the district. But how much more useful, if the list also included such things as clinic hours, specific services offered, traveling directions, fees involved, if any.

Or consider the neighborhood tours. Is it enough to look out on the community through the window of a bus while a narrator points out this feature or that characteristic of the area? Shouldn't there be visits inside the residences and public places in the community? Couldn't one learn much more about price policy in the ghetto if the tour allowed for some comparison shopping? Isn't it important that at

least a part of the summer training be given over to learning about the community when it is at its liveliest and most vibrant best, i.e. during weekends and late afternoons or early evenings?

The observers also took note of the materials used in the institutes, and tried to make some assessment on at least the following criteria: relevancy, variety, effectiveness.

One report suggested that "the materials used were suitable and effective in most instances (during the periods of observation in a single institute). There were a few exceptions." On another occasion, the observation was: "The math and science instructors used a wide variety of materials."

A constant complaint from both staff and participants was the fact that many items on order did not arrive in time for most effective use.

After having viewed several lessons at one institute, an observer put it this way: "Suitable? Yes. Effective? Not always. Not varied enough. Materials used were commercial . . . . Little use made of teacher-made materials . . . . No science materials were used."

Many similar opinions were expressed by other observers of other institutes. But it would be quite inaccurate to make any highly critical generalizations about all of the institutes visited. In almost every case, both complimentary and unfavorable comments were made about the materials and their use. Thus one observer remarked on the relative scarcity in a particular situation: "There were not enough materials for the participants to engage in the actual doing." But in another case, the supply was adequate.

In conclusion, the observers strove for an accurate, vital, sensitive accounting of as many aspects of the institute programs as possible. They achieved their purpose to a remarkable degree. It is necessary only to read their reports in order to realize their skill in the analysis of classroom interaction. The level of agreement between independent observers of the same activities greatly inspired confidence in what they said. Coupled with the self-evaluation of staff and participants, their reactions should give the reader a reasonably clear picture of what occurred in the six sample institutes.

## CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Now that the views of the participants, staff and observers have been expressed, it is logical that the next section of the report attempt some possible answers and suggest some likely directions.

The full story can never be known through dependence on people's self-evaluations and/or observer views. Hence, the degree to which the "evidence" is incomplete is the extent to which the conclusions deriving therefrom are inadequate.

It is profitable, nonetheless, to draw together, in the light of the available data, the significant items which are operative in the current programs, and to assess their probable influence on future programs. In this way, the resultant recommendations are more likely to be realistic and relevant.

PLANNING

One of the most important factors in the operation of this set of institutes is the fact that they were conducted in a decentralized setting. With few exceptions they deserve serious criticism for not having defined with greater clarity and specificity the objectives they wanted to achieve. The chart on p. 23 illustrates the point well. It is more sharply delineated by the following comment of a codirector. An observer asked whether the participants knew the objectives of the program and, if so, how they got the information. Her reply was that she felt they had "heard by the grape vine" that the institute would deal with the disadvantaged.

The relative freedom to design a program that is responsive to local needs is an extremely important concept, and vital to the survival of public education. Nevertheless, it does place an unaccustomed responsibility on the shoulders of those who would ordinarily be implementing a "package" handed down from a central office.

There has neither been time nor training for the new role which is being required of the local school officials, and it is to be expected that some of their first attempts will be less than adequate.

The guidelines which went out to all of the districts from Board of Education headquarters included the following purposes: 1) "To develop and implement a program for training of teachers newly assigned

to the elementary and intermediate schools located in a disadvantaged neighborhood and enrolling a large majority of disadvantaged pupils." 2) "To train teachers of disadvantaged children in the teaching of reading."

Clearly the onus was on the local leadership to construct programs that would have very specific goals. This is a logical development; because if the concept of decentralization is to remain intact, then the guidelines must be loose enough to allow for variation and expression of individual needs.

The local school staff and community people are the ones closest to the educational problems of the area. It follows that any planning for institutes that are designed to deal with those problems should be done jointly by representatives from both groups.

If the final authority for approving the plans rests with the district superintendent, then such approval should be forthcoming only after he has convinced himself that they reveal some tentative answers to at least the following three questions:

1) What <u>specifically</u>, do you expect to accomplish? (It is not sufficient to say "train teachers," or "orient teachers," or any other of the commonplace expressions which do not communicate with precision, but which often pass for precise goals. If the object is to help teachers to acquire skill in the use of certain techniques, then it should be so stated. If it is to affect their teaching styles with, or their approaches to a particular segment of the pupil population, again it should be set down as precisely as possible).

2) How do you hope to accomplish the objectives? i.e. What things will you actually do? A typical answer might be: "Small group discussions and seminars." But what is discussed in the small group? What is the content of the seminar? Are these techniques the most appropriate for achieving the stated objectives?

3) How will you know if you have reached your goals? Too often the matter of evaluation is an afterthought, when in fact it ought to be taken into consideration at the time of planning. Issues and goals which are unclear often become more sharply defined as the planners also strive to outline an evaluation design.

As an example, if this question had been dealt with when the current institutes were being designed, it would have become apparent in the beginning that it is not possible to assess the degree of improvement of a teacher's effectiveness with disadvantaged children in the absence of two very critical factors:

(a) some measure of his effectiveness before he became involved in the institute.

(b) an opportunity for him to work with children as an integral part of the institute activities.

The first was completely missing from all of the programs studied. The second was partially true and for only a few of the six institutes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1) Future institutes should be planned jointly by school and community people.

2) The objectives should be clear-cut and specific, and communicated clearly to the participants.

3) Plans for evaluation should be part of the initial design. This means that the evaluator should be involved in the planning from the beginning.

SELECTION OF STAFF & INVOLVEMENT OF CHILDREN

Throughout the report the observers, several participants, and even some members of the staff itself were often complaining about the qualifications of many among the instructor group.

It seems logical that in an institute whose purpose is to increase teachers' effectiveness with disadvantaged children, the instructors ought surely to be people who have worked successfully with such children.

Because this was not the case in many instances, it becomes necessary to raise some questions about how the staff was selected, and to make some suggestions about how they ought to be chosen in the future.

No easily defined pattern has emerged regarding the method of staff selection among the six sample institutes. The coordinators were principals and/or assistant principals in the main; but it is not always clear why a particular person was chosen. An occasional participant has hinted at favoritism, but again there is no way to document this view. What is important is that some instructors were put into the position of being "experts" in areas for which their backgrounds had not prepared them.

In another setting this might even be a commendable move, demonstrating faith in the person's capacity for learning on the job. But

the time period over which the Summer Institutes must operate is much too short to allow for this kind of learning as you go. Besides, the format of most of the institutes did not include, as an integral part of their organization, the opportunity for systematic and daily, direct work with children.

There would be little reason, therefore, to expect that on-the-job training for the instructors would be of an intense enough quality in the area where they needed the greatest expertise. In fact, it is highly questionable whether the participants can honestly receive adequate training in effectiveness with disadvantaged children, if there are no children with whom they can attempt to put into practice the ideas discussed in small group meetings.

Demonstration lessons alone will not serve this need -- and even these were in short supply. Unfortunately, the assumption often is that if the teacher simply learns more techniques, or is made more aware of the children's special needs, then it follows that he will become more effective.

This simplistic view fails to take into account other factors which also influence effective teaching. Among these are the teacher's expectations, his attitude toward his pupils, his capacity to work well with children whose views of life are significantly different from his own, his willingness to endure trials by fire until he has convinced the children of his sincerity, his tolerance for unorthodoxy in the classroom.

To talk realistically about improving teacher effectiveness, therefore, is to provide the context in which such improvement can take place, and this calls for systematic work with children.

One institute group suggested that youngsters be paid a stipend and be invited to "serve" in the institute. The idea is not as preposterous as it might seem at first, even to many sophisticated teachers. But if the concept of remuneration for learning one's craft is acceptable, then it has not been done violence if some of the money is paid to the students.

In fact, there could be shifting roles for the children. They would be the learners for most of each day; but occasionally they could serve as discussants from whom the participants could learn a great deal about their own skill or lack of it in their interaction with the children.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1) Select as institute staff only those who have shown an enviable competence in the area of their institute roles. The district superintendent, his staff, local administrators and teachers, community people, all should be encouraged to identify possible candidates. The process should begin early enough in the year to allow a screening panel to select the most highly qualified for the specific demands of the program.

2) Plan the institute around a class or classes of children (disadvantaged ones for obvious reasons) who are profitably engaged in a bona fide pursuit of knowledge. In this way their involvement would have real meaning for them, and the enrollees would be "teaching" in an honest setting in which the goals are real and legitimate.

SUMMER INSTITUTES

For a variety of reasons, it is no longer feasible to think of school as going only from September to June. As a matter of fact, the activities during the summer may in some ways exceed those of the "regular" school year.

It is a profitable use of time to devote the summer to institutes and to other kinds of short-term, intense training which might not be as conveniently done during the winter and spring terms. During the summer, it is also possible to test unusual, organizational arrangements, and to try out ideas which might be stifled in the day-to-day structure and operation of the regular school.

But the summer work should not be perceived as an entity with no prior or later connections. Instead, there should be a deliberate attempt to design what is done in this period as a natural sequel to what was done in the preceding months, and at the same time plan for the logical continuation or tie-in during the succeeding year.

Under this plan, the summer teacher training institutes would be only one phase in a well articulated program, which lasted over a long enough period to allow for a much more realistic approach to the successful teaching of disadvantaged children.

SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

The selection of participants would also become crucial if the above design were followed. For the sake of the desired continuity, it would be necessary to choose enrollees on a more systematic basis. The emphasis could still continue to be on beginning and/or inexperienced

teachers -- if this were the focus.

Often a serious impediment to the successful carrying out of ideas gleaned from one training program or another is the fact that when the teacher gets back to her school, she may find a more hostile, less receptive atmosphere. She quickly becomes discouraged, and the chances are good that she will revert to the old ways and eschew the new ideas which are apparently too threatening for her colleagues.

There is little reason to believe that such a situation will not occur repeatedly, following the set of institutes under discussion. Even if the teachers in a given institute came from the same district, there was no built-in component for dealing with the problem of receptivity and support at the school level.

RECOMMENDATION

Enrollment in a given institute should be open only to teams from the same schools rather than to individuals regardless of school affiliation.

The team should include teachers and supervisors who ordinarily work together in their school. Not only does this make for greater sharing during the training period, but it almost guarantees a mutual support for each other when they go back to their school. Another pay-off is that the supervisor member of the team will have the status and, hopefully, the authority to help create the receptive attitude which is too often missing.

THE INSTITUTE PROGRAM

The observers were especially critical of many aspects of the institute program, describing it as traditional, unimaginative, uninspiring. Some members of the staff were also vocal in their disapproval: "too much like the methods books."

These comments are well deserved. A summer program, especially one that is seeking to stimulate in teachers the adoption of new and different approaches, not only has the opportunity but the obligation to be excitingly unorthodox. Some of the institutes demonstrated a flair for this, occasionally. But, in the main, the six sample institutes were dull, repetitive sessions, often dealing with pseudo issues (v. pp. 37-38) instead of grappling with really important problems. The participants certainly supported this view by their attitude, e.g. reading the newspaper, polishing their nails, sleeping, while activities were in session. (v. pp. 38-39 and Table VIII).

Another damaging piece of evidence is the fact that in five of the six institutes studied, anywhere from one-fifth to almost one-half of the participants said they would not advise attendance by others. (v. Table VIII).

Some representative comments by the group illustrate their reasons:

> "Not if it's run like this one. Institutes are needed; but trainees need reality, not theory."

"Stipend too low."

"Being held responsibl for your attendance (having to punch in ar ut) requires remuneration."

"As it is presently run, it is designed to teach new teachers old methods."

"Learned next to nothing in 50 hours. What I learned could have been meaningfully given in five hours. . ."

"I wasted two weeks of my time, the government has wasted a lot of my money! Show me a valid institute, one which guides."

The very existence of the institutes is living testimony to the abject failure of the usual techniques with a significant minority of the pupil population. To use the vehicle of the institute as a means of propagating the same tired dogma is a mockery of the intent. Such a miscarriage of purpose, under the guise of preparing teachers for greater effectiveness, is reprehensible, to say the very least, and has no place in an enlightened system which, in many quarters, is genuinely seeking solutions to an urgent, massive problem.

It is important to communicate the recognition that not everyone who might be "guilty" of slavish adherence to the so-called traditional methods is either ineffectual or necessarily party to a travesty. Some traditional approaches and techniques do work with disadvantaged children. Equally important, some teachers do not have the capacity for working in the relatively unstructured way of many innovative programs. To mandate every teacher to adopt new ways is as rigid and short-sighted as worshipping at the altar of "tried and true" methods. More than anything, what is needed is flexibility in teaching behavior, coupled with a

willingness to "try it another way," and a tolerance for the unusual.

The role of the summer institute emerges more clearly in the light of the foregoing.

RECOMMENDATION

Include in the design of each institute an "experimental" component. That is, set aside a segment of time daily/weekly in which to try out as many of the unorthodox techniques and approaches as the imagination and courage will permit. Although the initial planning should have explored several possible activities for that segment, there should be a sufficient looseness to allow for the incorporation of later ideas and changes as the situation warrants.

CONCLUDING STATEMENT

Ultimately the factor which plays perhaps the greatest single role in the success or failure of training institutes for teachers of the disadvantaged is the philosophy underlying their existence and operation.

The way in which the supposedly disadvantaged children are viewed will clearly determine the kind of "solution" being sought. Thus, if the cause for failure is perceived as being within them, the emphasis will be on programs that are designed to change them.

If, on the other hand, the educational system is recognized as having a major part in the failure, then, hopefully, the search will be on for ways in which to change the system so as to improve its efficiency, and thus succeed in those instances where it had known only failure.

There is serious question whether the current crop of institutes, as represented by the samples, did not adhere to the former rather than to the latter view. As evidence, only 17 per cent of the participants suggested that a reason for their involvement was the possibility of changes in themselves, i.e. in their perceptions, their approaches, their expectations. In addition, among the four major objectives identified by the staff, only one indirectly involved similar changes in these areas -- "Develop in teachers an understanding of disadvantaged children." The observers, too, reported how many of the programs lacked sparkle or innovative thrust. In fact, with few exceptions, they could be described as "more of the same."

It would seem that an underlying assumption in each of these pieces of supportive evidence is the belief that the usual approaches and techniques are appropriate and sufficient, provided they are repeated often enough.

Given the truth of this observation, the participants and staff were, indeed, seeking to change the child without making a comparable search for ways of changing the system. This is a one-sided and therefore erroneous view -- the logical extension of a very questionable assumption. For surely, if the schools have failed a particular segment of the student population, a realistic attempt to identify possible reasons for the failure would necessarily include looking at both the schools and the students.

No institute, no matter how efficiently organized, can expect to make a significant improvement in teacher effectiveness with "disadvantaged" children until it recognizes and fulfills its obligation to bring about needed changes in the teachers' concepts, attitudes and beliefs, in addition to improving their techniques.

The challenge of teaching successfully children whose backgrounds have not prepared them for school's demands forces recognition of the need for more than technique. The teachers must bring to their tasks, in addition, a rich mixture of understanding, unorthodoxy, flexibility, high expectation and an abiding faith in the children's ability to learn.

If, as it has repeatedly announced, the Board of Education is genuinely concerned about the deteriorated conditions in ghetto schools, and is sincere in its determination to correct them, then future institutes must reflect in organization, concept and operation the enlightened philosophy that ghetto children are the victims and not the causes of the intolerable conditions leading to their academic failure.

The problem is massive and urgent. It will not yield to fragmented, ill-conceived programs which consume much money but offer little payoff. It demands concerted, massive effort in a climate of hopeful creativity. The Board has accepted the challenge. It remains to be seen how it will be carried out in future teacher institutes.

# APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A - Tables

A1

TABLE 1

*What specific reasons did you have for attending this institute?*

*(In ranking order)*

| | N = 273* No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Learn more effective reading techniques | 128 | 46.8 |
| 2. Become better teacher | 36 | 16.5 |
| 3. Gain greater knowledge about the dis-advantaged child | 49 | 18.2 |
| 4. Earn money | 44 | 13.0 |
| 5. Share problems with others | 12 | 3.3 |
| 6. Other | 13 | 3.3 |
| 7. No response | 2 | .7 |

*Breakdown by Institutes for Two Categories*

*(In ranking order)*

*Become better teacher*

| Institute | % |
|---|---|
| E | 8.7 |
| A | 9.6 |
| D | 10.4 |
| F | 19.1 |
| B | 22.6 |
| C | 27.5 |

*Earn Money*

| Institute | % |
|---|---|
| D | 20.8 |
| B | 16.7 |
| E | 15.2 |
| A | 9.6 |
| C | 8.6 |
| F | 6.5 |

*Refers to the number of responses. This number will vary from table to table since some participants gave multiple answers. The six institutes enrolled 273 participants.

TABLE 11

When you return to your classroom in September what things will you do differently?

Group I
(Related to content and curriculum)

Cognitive

(In ranking order)

N = 332

| | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Make motivation more relevant | 80 | 24.1 |
| 2. Make aims and objectives more specific | 44 | 13.3 |
| 3. No change | 36 | 10.9 |
| 4. Emphasize individualized reading more | 32 | 9.7 |
| 5. Others | 37 | 11.1 |
| 6. No response | 19 | 5.8 |
| | | 79.9 |

Group II
(Related to interaction with children)

Affective

(In ranking order)

N = 332

| | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Show greater sensitivity to disadvantaged children | 54 | 15.5 |
| 2. Participate more in community life | 13 | 4.6 |
| | | 20.1 |

## TABLE III

Identify those aspects of the program which influenced your thinking.

(In ranking order)

| | N = 257 No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Staff presentations other than those mentioned | 117 | 32.8 |
| 2. Guest speakers | 112 | 31.4 |
| 3. Small group discussions | 32 | 9.0 |
| 4. Field trips | 24 | 6.7 |
| 5. Materials | 11 | 3.1 |
| 6. Demonstration lessons | 11 | 3.1 |
| 7. Informal talks with others | 10 | 2.8 |
| 8. Demonstrating specific equipment | 7 | 1.9 |
| 9. Reading Assignments | 5 | 1.4 |

Breakdown by Institutes for Four Categories

(In ranking order)

| | N = 73 A No. | % | N = 70 B No. | % | N = 69 C No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Guest speakers | 18 | 24.8 | 14 | 20.0 | 23 | 33.8 |
| 2. Staff presentations other than those mentioned | 16 | 21.9 | 40 | 57.1 | 23 | 33.8 |
| 3. Demonstration lessons | 3 | 4.1 | 2 | 2.9 | 6 | 9.0 |
| 4. Small group discussions | 12 | 16.4 | 1 | 1.4 | 8 | 11.7 |

| | N = 57 D No. | % | N = 41 E No. | % | N = 48 E No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Guest speakers | 6 | 10.5 | 6 | 14.5 | 17 | 35.4 |
| 2. Staff presentations other than those mentioned | 26 | 45.6 | 21 | 51.0 | 17 | 35.4 |
| 3. Demonstration lessons | 3 | 5.3 | 4 | 9.8 | 1 | 2.1 |
| 4. Small group discussions | 5 | 8.8 | 5 | 12.2 | 1 | 2.1 |

## TABLE IV-A

Rate each aspect of the institute.

(In ranking order)

| Guest Speakers | N = 267 No. | % | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Extremely valuable | 175 | 65.6 | 90.7 |
| Valuable | 67 | 25.1 | |
| No value | 25 | 9.3 | |

Breakdown by Institutes for Guest Speakers

(In ranking order)

| | N = 42 C No. | % | | N = 57 A No. | % | | N = 52 B No. | % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Extremely valuable | 37 | 88.1 | 100 | 37 | 64.9 | 96.5 | 40 | 76.9 | 92.3 |
| Valuable | 5 | 11.9 | | 18 | 31.6 | | 8 | 15.4 | |
| No value | - | - | | 2 | 3.5 | | 4 | 7.7 | |

| | N = 36 F No. | % | | N = 38 E No. | % | | N = 42 D No. | % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Extremely valuable | 19 | 52.8 | 86.1 | 19 | 50.0 | 84.2 | 23 | 54.8 | 81.0 |
| Valuable | 12 | 33.3 | | 13 | 34.2 | | 11 | 26.2 | |
| No value | 5 | 13.9 | | 6 | 15.8 | | 8 | 19.2 | |

## TABLE IV-B

Rate each aspect of the institute.

(In ranking order)

| Staff Presentations other than those mentioned | N = 239 No. | % | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Extremely valuable | 129 | 54.0 | 82.3 |
| Valuable | 68 | 28.3 | |
| No value | 42 | 17.7 | |

Breakdown by Institutes for Staff Presentations Other Than Those Mentioned

(In ranking order)

| | N = 41 C | | N = 34 D | | N = 47 B | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Extremely valuable | 29 | 69.3 | 18 | 53.0 | 33 | 70.1 |
| Valuable | 11 | 28.1 | 13 | 38.1 | 9 | 19.2 |
| | | 97.4 | | 91.1 | | 89.3 |
| No value | 1 | 2.6 | 3 | 8.9 | 5 | 10.7 |

| | N = 36 E | | N = 33 F | | N = 50 A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Extremely valuable | 21 | 58.5 | 10 | 30.1 | 20 | 40.0 |
| Valuable | 9 | 25.1 | 15 | 45.5 | 11 | 22.0 |
| | | 83.6 | | 75.6 | | 62.0 |
| No value | 6 | 16.4 | 8 | 24.4 | 19 | 38.0 |

## TABLE IV-C

Rate each aspect of the institute.

(In ranking order)

| Demonstation Lessons | N = 263 No. | % | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Extremely valuable | 177 | 67.4) | 87.4 |
| Valuable | 50 | 19.0) | |
| No value | 36 | 13.6 | |

Breakdown by Institutes for Demonstration Lessons

(In ranking order)

| | N = 37 E No. | % | | N = 42 C No. | % | | N = 41 D No. | % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Extremely valuable | 31 | 83.8) | 97.3 | 39 | 92.8) | 95.2 | 24 | 58.7) | 90.4 |
| Valuable | 5 | 13.5) | | 1 | 2.4) | | 13 | 31.7) | |
| No value | 1 | 2.7 | | 2 | 4.8 | | 4 | 9.6 | |

| | N = 51 B No. | % | | N = 34 F No. | % | | N = 58 A No. | % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Extremely valuable | 39 | 76.5) | 90.2 | 14 | 41.2) | 82.4 | 30 | 51.6) | 68.9 |
| Valuable | 7 | 13.7) | | 14 | 41.2) | | 10 | 17.3) | |
| No value | 5 | 9.8 | | 6 | 17.6 | | 18 | 31.1 | |

## TABLE IV-D

Rate each aspect of the institute.

(In ranking order)

| Small Group Discussions | N = 266 No. | % | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Extremely valuable | 148 | 55.6) | 81.2 |
| Valuable | 68 | 25.6) | |
| No value | 50 | 18.8 | |

Breakdown by Institutes for Small Group Discussions

(In ranking order)

| | N = 44 C | | | N = 37 E | | | N = 39 D | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | | No. | % | | No. | % | |
| Extremely valuable | 36 | 81.8) | 95.4 | 22 | 59.5) | 91.9 | 24 | 61.5) | 89.7 |
| Valuable | 6 | 13.6) | | 12 | 32.4) | | 11 | 28.2) | |
| No value | 2 | 4.5 | | 3 | 8.1 | | 4 | 10.3 | |

| | N = 55 B | | | N = 60 A | | | N = 31 F | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | | No. | % | | No. | % | |
| Extremely valuable | 24 | 43.6) | 78.1 | 37 | 61.6) | 71.6 | 5 | 16.1) | 61.3 |
| Valuable | 19 | 34.5) | | 6 | 10.0) | | 14 | 45.2) | |
| No value | 12 | 21.8 | | 17 | 28.4 | | 12 | 38.7 | |

## TABLE V-A

Stated Objectives

List of Recommended Changes in Stated Objectives

(In ranking order)

| | N = 188 | |
|---|---|---|
| | No. | % |
| No change. | 113 | 60.0 |
| State objectives more clearly and specifically. | 25 | 13.3 |
| Concentrate more on teaching techniques for disadvantaged children. | 20 | 10.7 |
| Include more information about the nature of disadvantaged children. | 9 | 4.8 |
| Include more clerical work and routine. | 5 | 2.7 |
| Broaden objectives to include other segments of the population. | 5 | 2.7 |
| Include more on preparing lessons. | 4 | 2.1 |
| Include more on discipline problems. | 4 | 2.1 |
| Stress the relationship of the teacher to the community. | 3 | 1.6 |

Breakdown by Institutes for Four Categories

(In ranking order)

| | N = 30 D | | N = 30 C | | N = 34 B | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| No change | 27 | 90.0 | 24 | 80.0 | 21 | 62.0 |
| State objectives more clearly and specifically | 2 | 6.7 | 3 | 10.0 | 5 | 14.7 |
| Concentrate more on teaching techniques for disadvantaged children | 1 | 3.3 | - | - | 4 | 11.8 |
| Include more information about the nature of disadvantaged children | - | - | 3 | 10.0 | - | - |

**TABLE V-A (Continued)**

| | N = 29 E | | N = 40 A | | N = 25 F | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| No change. | 18 | 62.0 | 17 | 42.5 | 6 | 24.0 |
| State objectives more clearly and specifically. | 1 | 3.5 | 10 | 25.0 | 4 | 16.0 |
| Concentrate more on teaching techniques for disadvantaged children. | 2 | 6.9 | 5 | 12.5 | 8 | 32.0 |
| Include more information about the nature of disadvantaged children. | 1 | 3.4 | 5 | 12.5 | - | - |

## TABLE V-B

Partial list of recommended changes in Program Content.

(In ranking order)

N = 184*

| | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| No change | 58 | 31.3 |
| Make content more concrete, less theoretical | 32 | 17.4 |
| Greater emphasis on traditional curriculum areas | 28 | 15.2 |
| Let content grow out of actual interaction (child/teacher) | 27 | 14.7 |
| Stress teaching techniques more | 17 | 9.3 |
| Present content which is decided upon by participants | 6 | 3.3 |
| Emphasize parents and community (how to deal with) | 5 | 2.7 |

Breakdown by Institutes for Four Categories

(In ranking order)

No Change

| Institute | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| D (N = 28) | 12 | 42.6 |
| B (N = 31) | 13 | 42.0 |
| C (N = 27) | 9 | 33.0 |
| E (N = 27) | 8 | 29.3 |
| A (N = 42) | 12 | 28.3 |
| F (N = 29) | 4 | 13.8 |

Greater emphasis on traditional curriculum areas

| Institute | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| E (N = 27) | 8 | 29.3 |
| C (N = 27) | 6 | 22.1 |
| F (N = 29) | 5 | 17.3 |
| B (N = 31) | 4 | 12.9 |
| A (N = 42) | 3 | 7.3 |
| D (N = 28) | 2 | 7.2 |

Make content more concrete, less theoretical

| Institute | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| A (N = 42) | 16 | 38.1 |
| F (N = 29) | 6 | 20.4 |
| E (N = 27) | 4 | 14.8 |
| B (N = 42) | 4 | 12.9 |
| D (N = 28) | 2 | 7.2 |
| C (N = 27) | - | - |

Let content grow out of actual interaction (c/t)

| Institute | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| D (N = 28) | 5 | 17.9 |
| C (N = 27) | 4 | 14.8 |
| E (N = 27) | 4 | 14.8 |
| A (N = 42) | 6 | 14.3 |
| F (N = 29) | 4 | 13.8 |
| B (N = 42) | 4 | 12.9 |

*There were 65 irrelevant responses. Forty-one people did not answer at all.

## TABLE V-C

Partial list of recommended changes in Selection of Staff.

(In ranking order)

| | N = 211 No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| No change | 121 | 57.0 |
| Select more qualified teachers | 18 | 8.5 |
| Select instructors who have worked with disadvantaged children | 18 | 8.5 |
| Do not select supervisors (i.e. A.P.'s) | 7 | 3.3 |
| Select staff who are more objective | 5 | 2.4 |
| Use specialists in curriculum areas | 5 | 2.4 |
| Select minority group staff members | 5 | 2.4 |
| Include more teachers from "elementary" level | 5 | 2.4 |
| Select a more qualified coordinator | 5 | 2.4 |
| Select a more dynamic staff | 4 | 1.9 |

Breakdown by Institutes for One Category

(In ranking order)

| | No Change | |
|---|---|---|
| Institute | No. | % |
| E (N = 25) | 17 | 68.0 |
| D (N = 34) | 22 | 64.7 |
| B (N = 39) | 23 | 59.0 |
| C (N = 38) | 22 | 58.0 |
| F (N = 28) | 15 | 53.5 |
| A (N = 47) | 22 | 46.9 |

## TABLE VI-A

In what ways do you feel differently about these children?

(In ranking order)

| | N = 175 | |
|---|---|---|
| | No. | % |
| No change | 108 | 61.8 |
| Greater desire to help them | 17 | 9.7 |
| More sympathetic | 14 | 8.0 |
| Greater hope and/or higher expectations | 11 | 6.3 |
| More patient and tolerant | 9 | 5.3 |
| They are as human as other children | 4 | 2.3 |
| See disadvantaged children as individuals - not as group | 4 | 2.3 |
| Must be firmer (not punitive) | 3 | 1.7 |
| More negative | 3 | 1.7 |
| More empathetic | 2 | 1.1 |

| | No. | |
|---|---|---|
| irrelevant responses | 52 | 98 |
| no responses | 46 | |

TABLE VI-A1

What ways do you feel differently about these children?

| Institute | A | | B | | C | | D | | E | | F | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 36 | | N = 31 | | N = 28 | | N = 35 | | N = 24 | | N = 26 | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| No Change | 30 | 83.2 | 14 | 45.1 | 18 | 64.4 | 20 | 60.6 | 13 | 57.3 | 14 | 54.0 |
| Greater desire to help them | 1 | 2.8 | 6 | 19.4 | 2 | 7.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 5 | 23.4 | 2 | 7.7 |
| More sympathetic | 1 | 2.8 | - | - | 4 | 14.3 | 3 | 9.1 | 1 | 4.8 | 4 | 15.4 |
| Greater hope and/or higher expectations | - | - | 5 | 16.2 | 2 | 7.1 | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 9.6 | 1 | 3.8 |
| More patient and tolerant | 1 | 2.8 | - | - | 2 | 7.1 | 6 | 18.2 | - | - | - | - |
| They are as human as other children | - | - | 2 | 6.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 7.7 |
| See disadvantaged children as individuals - not as a group | 1 | 2.8 | 1 | 3.2 | - | - | 1 | 3.0 | - | - | 1 | 3.8 |
| Must be firmer (not punitive) | 1 | 2.8 | 1 | 3.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 3.8 |
| More negative | 1 | 2.8 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 3.0 | - | - | 1 | 3.8 |
| More empathetic | - | - | 1 | 3.2 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 4.8 | - | - |
| | No. | | No. | | No. | | No. | | No. | | No. | |
| Irrelevant Responses | 13 | | 10 | | 8 | | 9 | | 6 | | 6 | |
| No Responses | 13 | | 9 | | 7 | | 6 | | 7 | | 4 | |
| Total | 26 | | 19 | | 15 | | 15 | | 13 | | 10 | |

TABLE VI-3

To what extent do you feel your teaching skills with these children have been improved?

Partial List of Responses*

(In ranking order)

| | No. | % (N = 146) |
|---|---|---|
| No change | 33 | 21.9 |
| Motivate in new ways | 24 | 16.9 |
| Skills can't be evaluated at this time | 20 | 14.1 |
| Feels able to analyse and solve individual reading weaknesses | 13 | 9.2 |
| Skill in setting goals relevant to child's need | 7 | 4.9 |
| Greater skill in recognizing pupils' level of achievement | 5 | 3.5 |
| Greater skill in the use of teaching machines and aids | 4 | 2.8 |

Breakdown by Institutes for Three Categories

(In ranking order)

No Change

| Institute | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| F (N = 19) | 11 | 57.9 |
| D (N = 21) | 8 | 38.1 |
| A (N = 29) | 10 | 34.0 |
| B (N = 34) | 5 | 14.7 |
| C (N = 24) | 3 | 12.5 |
| E (N = 15) | 1 | 6.7 |

Skills can't be evaluated

| Institute | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| E (N = 15) | 4 | 26.6 |
| C (N = 24) | 5 | 20.8 |
| A (N = 29) | 6 | 20.7 |
| F (N = 19) | 2 | 10.5 |
| B (N = 34) | 3 | 8.8 |
| D (N = 21) | - | - |

Greater skill in recognizing pupils' level of achievement

| Institute | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| B (N = 34) | 3 | 8.8 |
| E (N = 15) | 1 | 6.7 |
| D (N = 21) | 1 | 4.7 |
| A (N = 29) | - | - |
| C (N = 24) | - | - |
| F (N = 19) | - | - |

*There were 107 irrelevant responses. Thirty-six people did not answer at all.

TABLE VII

How well did the staff and participants communicate with each other?

| | N = 179 | |
|---|---|---|
| | No. | % |
| Positive responses | 170 | 95.0 |
| Negative responses | 39 | 21.8 |
| No responses | 26 | 14.5 |

Breakdown by Institutes in Ranking Order

Positive responses

| Institute | % |
|---|---|
| C | 95.1 |
| D | 80.6 |
| E | 66.7 |
| F | 57.1 |
| B | 56.6 |
| A | 56.3 |

Negative responses

| Institute | % |
|---|---|
| F | 40.5 |
| A | 28.1 |
| B | 26.4 |
| E | 19.4 |
| D | 6.5 |
| C | 2.4 |

No responses

| Institute | % |
|---|---|
| B | 17.0 |
| A | 15.6 |
| E | 13.9 |
| D | 12.6 |
| C | 2.4 |
| F | 2.4 |

## TABLE VIII

Would you advise your teacher friends to attend a future institute?

N = 263

| | | No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| yes - without money | 74.6 | 139 | 52.9 |
| yes - with money | 46.7 | 57 | 21.7 |
| no | | 67 | 25.0 |

Breakdown by Institutes in Ranking Order

| No's | | No's and yes with money | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | 45% | A | 65% |
| F | 38.9% | F | 58.3% |
| B | 20% | D | 50% |
| D | 20% | B | 46% |
| E | 19.4% | E | 30.6% |
| C | 2.4% | C | 24.3% |

# APPENDIX B

-

## Instruments

B1

Bank Street College of Education 69 Bank Street New York, N. Y. 10014

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES CENTER

103 East 125 Street New York, N. Y. 10035 Tel. 831-1200

Summer 1967

Ladies and Gentlemen:

As part of its arrangement with the New York City Board of Education, the Center for Urban Education has asked the Educational Resources Center, Bank Street College, to conduct an evaluation of the current series of Training Institutes for Teachers of the Disadvantaged.

We are delighted to take part in this activity, especially because we believe firmly that whatever recommendations are forthcoming as a result will surely mean improved and more effective institutes in the future.

You certainly are aware of the significant role you play in this endeavor. We therefore urge your full cooperation in the following two ways:

1. Periodically, some observers will appear on the scene and will not only record their impressions of what is occurring, but will be seeking the opportunity to speak with many of you informally.

2. Toward the end of your institute we will ask you to fill out a short questionnaire.

Please understand that our interest is only in learning from the present in order to improve the future. Do not identify yourself. We hope that you will feel free to answer the questions with absolute candor. It is only in this way that we can expect to arrive at a reasonably accurate account of what has gone on.

We appreciate your cooperation, and thank you sincerely.

Very truly,

M. Sylvester King

M. Sylvester King
Director

B2

Title 1 Evaluations
Conducted for
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
by
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES CENTER
M. Sylvester King, Director

Summer 1967

## Observation Guideline

### I. Description of Center

a. location
b. duration
c. type (Rdg., T.T.) no. of participants - registered
no. of participants - present
d. profiles of participants
e. profiles of instructors (educ. bkgd., experience, how relevant to current position?
f. atmosphere (free, restrictive)

### II. Instructional Program

a. quality
b. relevancy (to needs of participants, to objectives of program)
c. methods (lecture, demonstration, participating, e.g. small group seminars, guest speaker)
d. materials (suitability, effectiveness, variety, quantity)

### III. Evaluation

a. What desirable features? (enumerate)
b. What undesirable features? (enumerate)
c. What recommendations for improvement?

District_____

Title 1 Evaluations
Conducted for
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
by
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES CENTER
M. Sylvester King, Director

Summer 1967

## SUMMER TRAINING INSTITUTE

Name of Participant_____

Home Address_____

Assignment for September_____

### College Experience

| Years | College | Degree | Major |
|---|---|---|---|
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Other Post High School Training:

_____

_____

List Courses or types of contact related to Minority Groups (Camping, Workshops, discussion sessions, etc.)

_____

_____

Years of Teaching Experience _____ _____ _____

Years of Experience in Special Service Schools _____ _____ _____

What are your professional ambitions? _____

_____

Professional affiliations, if any:_____

_____

Summer 1967

Dear Participants:

We invite your cooperation in completing the attached questionnaire. Please DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME on any part of the form.

We urge you to answer as candidly as you can, and to use additional sheets of paper wherever you feel the need.

Thank you sincerely,

M. Sylvester King, Director
Educational Resources Center

Title I Evaluations
Conducted for
CENTER for URBAN EDUCATION
by
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES CENTER
M. Sylvester King, Director

Summer 1967

Summer Institutes for Teachers of the Disadvantaged

PARTICPANTS' EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Note: Please use reverse side of page if more space is needed for your answers.

1. What specific reasons did you have for attending this Institute?

2. When you return to your classroom in September, what are some of the things you will do differently as a result of attending this Institute? (Please give as full an account as possible).

3. Please identify those aspects of the training program which influenced your thinking.

4. If you were given the opportunity to plan next year's Institute, what changes, if any, would you make in any or all of the following:

- The stated objectives

- The organization and schedule

- The program content

- The selection of staff

- The facilities and equipment

- The selection of participants

5a. What things do you now know about disadvantaged children that you did not know before?

5b. In what ways do you feel differently about these children?

5c. To what extent do you feel your teaching skills (<u>with these children</u>) have been improved?

6a. Would you advise your teacher friends to attend a future institute for teachers of the disadvantaged?

Yes_____ No_____ Not sure_____

6b. If you have checked "Yes" or "Not sure" would you give the same advice if no remuneration were offered?

Yes_____ No_____

6c. If you have checked "No" please state your reasons.

7. Listed below are some of the various aspects of the Institute's program. Please rate each one in terms of how valuable you found it to be by circling one of the numbers from -3 to +3. If you feel it was of no value, circle -3; if you feel it was extremely valuable, circle +3. If you feel it was somewhere in between, circle one of the numbers from -2 to +2. Then kindly explain your reasons for this rating in the space provided below the rating scale.

Of no Value — a. Guest Speakers — Extremely valuable

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

Reasons for rating: _____

_____

_____

b. Demonstrations of Special Equipment, such as Projectors, etc.

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

Reasons for rating: _____

_____

_____

c. Demonstration Lessons

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

Reaspns fpr rating: _____

_____

_____

d. Other Staff Presentations

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

Reasons for rating: _____

_____

_____

Of no Value — Extremely Valuable

e. Small Group Discussions

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

Reasons for rating: _____

_____

_____

f. Field Trips

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

Reasons for rating: _____

_____

_____

g. Reading Assignments

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

Reasons for rating: _____

_____

_____

h. Instructional Materials

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

Reasons for rating: _____

_____

_____

8. How well, in your estimation, did the staff and participants communicate with each other? (Please cite some specific examples to support your view.)

9. Of what value to you was the opportunity to share problems and ideas with other participants? Please explain fully.

B11

Summer 1967

Dear Staff:

We invite your cooperation in completing the attached questionnaire. Please DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME on any part of the form.

We urge you to answer as candidly as you can, and to use additional sheets of paper wherever you feel the need.

Thank you sincerely,

M. Sylvester King, Director
Educational Resources Center

Title I Evaluations
Conducted for
CENTER for URBAN EDUCATION
By
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES CENTER
M. Sylvester King, Director

Summer 1967

Summer Institutes for Teachers of the Disadvantaged

STAFF EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Note: Please use reverse side of page if more space is needed for your answers.

1. Of the several objectives of the Institute, which did you personally feel was the most important? second most important? etc.

2. In your opinion, which aspects of the Institute program (i.e. speakers, demonstration lessons, small group meetings, trips, etc.) were of most value to participants? (Why?)

3. In your opinion, which aspects were of least value? (Why?)

4. If you were setting up the Institute again next year, what changes would you make concerning each of the following areas?

   a. Selection of participants

   b. Program content

   c. Organization and time schedule

4. (continued)

d. Staff

e. Facilities and equipment

f. Guest speakers

5. What other suggestions for changes do you have?

6a. How would you rate the level of communication and cooperation among the members of the staff at your center? (Kindly explain and illustrate.)

6b. How would you rate the level of communication and cooperation between staff and participants at your center? (Kindly explain and illustrate)

7. What is your estimate of the impact of the program on the participants? (On what specific observations do you base this estimate?)

8. How has the Institute affected your <u>own</u> professional growth? (Please expalin)

# APPENDIX C

-

Staff List

Staff List

M. Sylvester King
Director
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES CENTER
Bank Street at Harlem
103 East 125th Street, N.Y.C.
formerly Assistant Principal
New York City Schools

Evelyn Farrar
Reading Consultant
School District #6
Instructor, Graduate Division
City College, City University, N.Y.

Michael Kinsler
Graduate Student,
Dept. of Education
City College, City University, N.Y.

Gaywood McGuire, Jr.
Teacher
Harlem Preparatory School
formerly with New York City Schools

Adelaide Sanford, Acting Principal
P.S. 21
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Marcella Williams
Senior Consultant
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES CENTER
Bank Street at Harlem
103 East 125th Street, N.Y.C.
Teacher (on leave)
New York City Schools